

### ARGUMENTS/REMARKS

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application. The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office action and the personal interview conducted on September 11, 2006, and amended as necessary to more clearly and particularly describe and claim the subject matter which applicants regard as the invention.

Claims 1-5, 7-28, and 30-52 remain in this application. Claims 6 and 29 have been previously canceled. New claims 53-59 have been added without adding any new matter.

Claim 51 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. ¶101 for not being directed toward statutory subject matter. The claim has been amended, making the rejection moot.

Claims 1-5, 7-12, 15, 18-39, 42-50, 51 (30-35), 51 (44-49), and 52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over by Saylor *et al.* (US 6792086) in view of Maes (U.S. 6,088,669). Claims 13-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Saylor and Maes in view of Beyda *et al.* (U.S. 6,487,277). Claims 16-17, 40-41, and 51(40-41) were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Saylor and Maes in further view of Woods *et al.* (U.S. 6,510,417). For the following reasons, the rejections are respectfully traversed.

The claims all recite the use of user-specific speech models, which are adapted to specific users, as was discussed at the personal interview. The Examiner recognizes that Saylor does not teach any such models, and thus cited Maes for such a teaching. However, the current independent claims, which recite a plurality of interactive voice response applications, have been amended to recite that “each of said interactive voice response applications includes an executable component for execution by said hosting system, said executable component comprising at least one of an executable file, a Java Bean, a Corba-component, a compiled software module, and a pre-compiled

software module". None of the cited references teach the use of such an executable component, and thus those claims, along with the claims that depend thereon, are patentable over the references.

Furthermore, as was discussed at the personal interview, the references fail to teach the use of any speaker dependent models that are updated without the use of a training phase, as Maes clearly teaches that such a training phase is necessary. The newly added independent claims all require that the updating or adding of new speaker dependent models occurs without any training phase (see, e.g., col. 5, lines 9-11 and 49-52). Furthermore, the new claims recite that a speaker independent model is used when a new speaker is identified, and that speaker dependent models are developed for the new speaker. These features are not found in the prior art, and thus the new claims are patentable over the references for at least these reasons.

In consideration of the foregoing analysis, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. 33226.

Respectfully submitted,  
PEARNE & GORDON, LLP

By: \_\_\_\_\_ / Robert F. Bodi /  
Robert F. Bodi, Reg. No. 48,540

1801 East 9<sup>th</sup> Street, Ste. 1200  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108  
(216) 579-1700

May 15, 2007